UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/722,973	11/26/2003	Kelly Ann Mohr	144761	9045
John S. Beulick	7590 06/25/200	EXAMINER		
Armstrong Teas		KISH, JAMES M		
Suite 2600 One Metropolit	an Square	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
St. Louis, MO 6		3737		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/25/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/722,973	MOHR ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	JAMES KISH	3/3/	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>27 April 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPI	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance	, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
 a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ac 	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth		
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	o). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	•	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extremely an extra time of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount on the corresponding amount of the corresponding a	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl	iance with 37 CFR 41 37 must be t	iled within two month	s of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS		20 () (()	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	sideration and/or search (see NOT		cause
(c) They have the issue of flew flatter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or	**	lucing or simplifying t	ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	orresponding number of finally reje	cted claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	1. See attached Notice of Non-Cor	mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			,
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1,4-11,13-17 and 19-24. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		be entered and an e	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	of the status of the claims after er	itry is below or attach	ed.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	•	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/BRIAN CASLER/	/James Kish/		
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3737	Examiner, Art Unit 3737		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Applicant argues that the prior art fails to the teach the claims as amended. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The amendments of "wherein the generated volume excludes a plurality of papillary muscles" does not read over the prior art. As Kanebako's images used for volume determination are created from contrast medium images via thresholding and edge detection, it is obvious that this would be an outline of the endocardium since the contrast medium would be in the patient's blood, thereby providing contrast for the cavity of the ventricle. Furthermore, it is unclear which papillary muscles are excluded. Therefore, some papillary muscles may be included while certain other papillary muscles may be excluded. For this reason, the prior art may still show some papillary muscles and read on the claims. It would be obvious for the images to not show all of the papillary muscles because Sheehan teaches that some anatomical landmarks may be used for border determination. As long two papillary muscles do not show up in the image, then Sheehan (and Kanebako) reads on the claims. It would be obvious to only include the important anatomical features required for a diagnosis in the images, which in certain circumstances would exclude papilary muscles. This would minimize required processing power and decrease the processing time. Furthermore, Sheehan teaches the option of manual tracing of these borders, and it would be obvious to exclude papillary muscles when they are insignificant to the diagnosis..